

REMARKS

Claims 1-22, 25-32 and 35 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 20,-22, 24, 25, 28-30, 32 and 35 have been amended while claims 5, 31 are canceled as shown at pages 2-7 of the Reply. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at page 9 line 25 – page 10 line 10.

Additionally, applicants' representative thanks Examiner Gelagay for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on May 2, 2007. The merits of the subject claims *vis-à-vis* the cited art were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection of Claim 9 Under 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claim 9 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Withdrawal of this objection is requested in view of the aforementioned amendment to this claim.

II. Objection of Claim 31 Under 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claim 31 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Withdrawal of this objection is requested in view of cancellation of this claim.

III. Objection of Claim 32 Under 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claim 32 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. In view of the aforementioned amendment to this claim, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-7, 12-13, 15, 20, 22, 25, 28-30 and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 3-7, 12-13, 15, 20, 22, 25, 28-30 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In view of the aforementioned amendments to these claims, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 10 and 20-22 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.. In view of the aforementioned amendments to these claims canceling the trademarks, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 31 and 32 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 31 has been canceled while claim 32 has been amended per the Examiner's suggestions. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 20, 25-26, 31-32 and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 20, 25-26, 31-32 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Phillips, *et al.* (U.S. 6,721,555). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Phillips, *et al.* does not teach or suggest an identical invention as recited in the subject claims.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that "*each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (*quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) (emphasis added).

The subject claims relate to a framework for installing and/or authenticating remote and wireless device(s) through a common physical interface. A physical interface (e.g., cord, cable, cradle, dock, connector, biological interface, etc.) physically connects a wireless device to a network terminal which initiates an exchange of installation and/or authentication information or prompts the network terminal to install and/or authenticate the wireless device. To this end independent claims 1, 12, 20, 24, 25 and 35 recite similar features namely: *a physical interface component that physically couples at least two devices to establish a non-physical connection so that the at least two devices communicate wirelessly upon being physically decoupled*. Phillips, *et al.* does not teach or suggest such novel aspects.

Phillips, *et al.* relates to systems and methods for handling and supporting authentication protocols in a wireless communications network. Accordingly, a wireless phone (Mobile Terminal (MT2)) and accompanying electronic devices (Terminal Equipment (TE2)) are coupled through an interface between the wireless phone transceiver (Mobile Station Modem (MSM)) and an accompanying TE2 device called the R.sub.m interface. In mobile stations not employing separate TE2 devices, the communications interface between the MSM and any browser functionality built into the wireless phone is also called the R.sub.m interface. In fact, R.sub.m interface is a communication interface included in the terminal equipment such as a laptop computer to facilitate wireless communications with mobile terminal such as a wireless modem (See Phillips, *et al.* col.1 lines 30-45, col.8 lines 38-40). However, nowhere does Phillips, *et al.* teach or suggest that R.sub.m interface physically connects the terminal equipment with the mobile terminal and is later disconnected in order that they communicate wirelessly. In fact, from the detailed specification of Phillips, *et al.* it is clear that R.sub.m interface needs to be continuously connected in order to facilitate communication between the Mobile Terminal (MT2) and the accompanying electronic devices (Terminal Equipment (TE2)).

In contrast, the subject claims provide for physically connecting at least two devices so that they may exchange installation/authentication information with greater security and are later disconnected physically to facilitate wireless communications. By utilizing a physical interface component (e.g., cord, cradle, human, touch-pad, dock,

wand, wire, etc.) for the installation and/or authentication of a wireless device (e.g., speakers, headset, keyboard, mouse, monitor, access point, wireless card, PDA, MP3 player, etc.) to a network entity (e.g., stereo receiver, personal computer, WLAN, LAN, router, host to a wireless device, etc) the network is aware of *what* device and *when* a device is being installed and/or authenticated for the non-physical connection or wireless communication. Moreover, the security for authentication for the network entity and non-physical connection is increased with the use of the physical interface component (e.g., temporary hard-wired connection). Such novel aspects are not taught or suggested by Phillips, *et al.*

In view of at least the foregoing, it is clear that an identical invention as recited in the subject claims is not taught or suggested by Phillips, *et al.* Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested with respect to independent claims 1, 12, 20, 24, 25, 35 and all claims that respectively depend there from.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 27 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 27 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips, *et al.* in view of Plasson, *et al.* (US 6,795,688). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 27 and 30 depend from independent claims 1, 12, 20, 25, 35 and as stated *supra*, Phillips, *et al.* does not teach or suggest all aspects recited in these independent claims. Plasson, *et al.* relates to dynamically configuring a device adapted to be communicatively coupled in a wireless network with an attribute corresponding to a characteristic of the device. However, Plasson, *et al.* fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency of Phillips, *et al.* with respect to the subject independent claims. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is requested with respect to dependent claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 27 and 30.

IX. Rejection of Claims 7, 11, 22 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 11, 22 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips, *et al.* in view of Silvester (U.S. 20030172271). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 7, 11, 22 and 29 depend from independent claims 1, 20, 25 respectively and as stated *supra*, Phillips, *et al.* does

not teach or suggest all aspects recited in these independent claims. Silvester relates to wireless device set-up and authentication using voice stream identification information. However, Silvester fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency of Phillips, *et al.* with respect to the subject independent claims. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is requested with respect to dependent claims 7, 11, 22 and 29.

X. Rejection of Claims 13 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 13 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips, *et al.* in view of Chaskar, *et al.* (U.S. 20050066044). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 13 and 28 depend from independent claims 1 and 25 respectively and as stated *supra*, Phillips, *et al.* does not teach or suggest all aspects recited in these independent claims. Chaskar, *et al.* relates to an IP based system that employs a GPS component in connection with a position determining entity (PDE) to determine location of a target mobile station via the Internet. However, Chaskar, *et al.* fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency of Phillips, *et al.* with respect to the subject independent claims. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is requested with respect to dependent claims 13 and 28.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TURCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TURCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731